



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/728,523	12/02/2003	Paulo Marques	SP02-251	8280
22928	7590	03/07/2007	EXAMINER	
CORNING INCORPORATED			BOLDEN, ELIZABETH A	
SP-TI-3-1				
CORNING, NY 14831			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1755	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		03/07/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/728,523	MARQUES, PAULO
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Elizabeth A. Bolden	1755

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 October 2006.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 6-33 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 7-24 is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 6,25 and 26 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) 27-33 is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 02 December 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Election/Restrictions*

Applicant's election without traverse of Group I, Claims 1-6 in the reply filed on 9 March 2006 is acknowledged.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

### *Priority*

Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority based on an application filed at the European Patent Office on 3 December 2002. It is noted, however, that applicant has not filed a certified copy of the European application as required by 35 U.S.C. 119(b).

### *Oath/Declaration*

The Bibliographic Data Sheet refers to a foreign application filed 3 December 2002 at the European Patent Office with application number 02 292 981.4. However, neither the oath nor the transmittal letter claims priority to this application. Applicant has not complied with the requirements of 37 CFR 1.63©, since the oath, declaration or application data sheet does not acknowledge the filing of any foreign application. A new oath, declaration, or application data sheet is required in the body of which the present application should be identified by application number and filing date.

### *Specification*

Applicant's proposed amendments to the Specification in Table I are acceptable to the Examiner and will not be considered new matter with the exception of the correction of B<sub>2</sub>O. The correction of B<sub>2</sub>O to Ba<sub>2</sub>O is incorrect and should actually be corrected to read "BaO". Please use BaO when amending Table I of the Specification.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 1755

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 6, 25, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kosokabe et al., U.S. Patent 5,747,399.

Kosokabe et al. teach a glass composition having overlapping ranges of components with instant claims 6, 25, and 26. See Abstract, and column 2, lines 22-39. Kosokabe et al. teach overlapping ranges of CTE with instant claim 6. See column 2, lines 22-29.

Kosokabe et al. fail to teach any examples or compositional or property ranges that are sufficiently specific to anticipate the compositional and property ranges of instant claims 6, 25, and 26. However, overlapping ranges have been held to establish prima facie obviousness. See MPEP 2144.05.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have selected from the overlapping portion of the ranges disclosed by the reference because overlapping ranges have been held to establish prima facie obviousness. See MPEP 2144.05.

One of ordinary skill in the art would expect that a glass with overlapping compositional ranges would have the devitrification resistance, softening point, weight losses due to acid and alkali resistance testes properties as recited in instant claim 6.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 6 October 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Kosokabe et al. discloses too broad over compositional and property ranges. This is not deemed persuasive since the compositional and property ranges do overlap. Overlapping ranges have been held to establish prima facie obviousness. See MPEP 2144.05.

Applicants further argue that the examples of Kosokabe et al. do not disclose the properties as defined by the instant claims. This is not deemed persuasive since the reference is not limited to the examples alone for disclosure. See MPEP 2123.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

Claims 37-33 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

In reviewing the prior art for these claims, the further restriction of requiring the addition of the recited components renders these claims allowable.

***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Elizabeth A. Bolden whose telephone number is 571-272-1363. The examiner can normally be reached on 10 am to 8:30 pm every Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jerry Lorengo can be reached on 571-272-1233. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

EAB



J.A. LORENZO  
SUPPLYING PATENT EXAMINER